

Applc. No. 10/828,813
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 3, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, and 3-30 remain in the application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 13, 14, 17, 21, 22, and 25 have been amended. Claims 25-29 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 2 is being cancelled herewith.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-24 and 30 have been rejected as being obvious over Cyron (EP 0 134 002 A1) in view of Dias et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,474,587) (hereinafter "Dias") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in claim 2 and on page 13, lines 2-3 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Applic. No. 10/828,813
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 3, 2006

Claims 1 and 17 call for, inter alia:

the boundary region having a first layer thickness being less than a second layer thickness of the filter section, and the boundary region containing a compressed or compacted fiber assembly.

The Cyron reference discloses a filter layer that is constructed of a wire cloth that is bent to close the channels. Cyron explicitly discloses that the bending takes place without any change in the dimension of the wire cloth in any direction (page 2, line 33 to page 3, line 1). Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art knows that the wire cloth is a one-dimensional web that is not compressed. Therefore, the wire cloth of Cyron has the same thickness in the boundary region as in the intermediate section.

The Dias reference discloses porous fluid-permeable moldings of silicon carbide. Dias explicitly discloses that the wall of the body at both ends can be thickened to apply to afford a high conductivity to prevent excessive heating (column 3, lines 26-30). The Dias reference does not disclose a fiber material. Dias only discloses the thickening of a boundary region.

Applic. No. 10/828,813
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 3, 2006

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

As seen from the above given remarks, the references do not show or suggest the boundary region having a first layer thickness being less than a second layer thickness of the filter section, and the boundary region containing a compressed or compacted fiber assembly, as recited in claims 1 and 17 of the instant application.

The Cyron reference discloses a wire cloth. Cyron does not disclose a fiber material assembly that is compressed in a boundary region. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the boundary region has a first layer thickness that is less than a second layer thickness of the filter section, and the boundary region contains a compressed or compacted fiber assembly.

The Dias reference discloses a wall of a body that is thickened at both ends. Dias does not disclose a fiber material assembly that is compressed in a boundary region. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the boundary region has a first layer

Applic. No. 10/828,813
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 3, 2006

thickness that is less than a second layer thickness of the filter section, and the boundary region contains a compressed or compacted fiber assembly.

The references applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, it is believed that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Since claims 1 and 17 are believed to be allowable, dependent claims 3-16 and 18-24 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 and 17. Claims 1 and 17 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 and 17, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-30 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Applic. No. 10/828,813
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 3, 2006

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

April 26, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101